

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful consideration given the present patent application and for the indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner is also thanked for the accommodation given in a brief telephone conversation between himself and applicants' representative on July 20, 2006. In the conversation, the pending double patenting rejection and the applied art were discussed. No agreement was reached during the call.

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action dated April 28, 2006, and the references applied therein. In response, applicants have amended the specification; submitted herewith a Terminal Disclaimer; canceled claim 7, without prejudice; and added claim 9 to further define the invention. Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration in light of the following remarks is requested.

With respect to the specification, applicants have amended paragraphs 0065, 0079, and 0080. In particular, applicants have followed the suggested revisions found in the Office Action.

With respect to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-5, applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer and the appropriate fee. This terminal Disclaimer is being submitted to expedite prosecution of the claimed subject matter and should not be viewed as any acquiescence to the applied rejection.

With respect to the objection to claim 7, applicants have canceled the same and added new claim 9. Without acquiescing in any way to the substantive rejections made in the Office Action and merely to expedite the prosecution of the subject matter that the Office Action indicated is allowable, applicants have added new independent claim 9, which incorporates the substance of claim 7 and intervening claim 6 in independent form.

With respect to the application of U.S. Patent No. 5,509,163 to Morad against claims 1-6 and 8, applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. In particular, Morad fails to teach or suggest the combination of claim 1. For example, Morad fails to teach or suggest a shaft with an indexing surface having a cross section substantially in the shape of a regular polygon. Specifically, Morad discusses a middle section 28 of an inner shaft 12 as follows:

The middle section 28 comprises a multiplicity of longitudinal ribs 64 which are approximately six (6) inches in length. The multiplicity of longitudinal ribs 64 of

the middle section 28 are similar to a gear wheel and extend all around the middle section 28. The multiplicity of longitudinal ribs 64 are utilized for the spring-and-ratchet mechanism 20 shown in FIG. 4.

Morad, col. 6, lines 27-34; FIGS. 4 and 7. The ribs are described as being a "gear wheel." Morad is completely silent with respect to the ribs 64 having a "regular" polygonal shape in cross-section. As such, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Morad. Claims 2-6 and 8 depend from claim 1 and, thus, have the same patentable features thereof.

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



John M. Augustyn, Reg. No. 33,589
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: October 26, 2006